INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

2007-2008 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Educational Recovery Clinic

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications	Satisfactory	Lesson matches original description	Approaching Standard (2)	Criminal Background Checks	Non-Compliance
Recruiting Materials	Unsatisfactory	Instruction is clear	Meeting Standard (3)	Health/safety laws & regulations	In Compliance
Academic Program	Unsatisfactory	Time on task is appropriate	Meeting Standard (3)	Financial viability	In Compliance
Progress Reporting	Unsatisfactory	Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Approaching/Meeting Standard (2.5)		
Assessment and Individual Program Design	Unsatisfactory	Student/instructor ratio: 2:1; 3:1	Meeting Standard (3)		

ACTION NEEDED:

ERC is placed on probation for the 2008-2009 school year due to concerns regarding the on-site monitoring visit and submitted documentation as detailed in the enclosed monitoring report, as well as other concerns raised by districts. As such, ERC has been required to implement corrective actions to address all areas of concern.

- In addition to the information required under corrective action described in the attached probation letter, please consider the following suggestion:
    - Several districts expressed confusion with students' receipt of pre-assessment scores that were greater than 100%. ERC explained that students who score above grade level on the WRAT are given scores of greater than 100%. However, since this is likely to be confusing to parents and districts, it is suggested that a different scoring mechanism be derived, or that a detailed explanation of the scoring process for WRAT be provided to districts upon request.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
DOCUMENT ANALYSIS Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Educational Recovery Clinic
REVIEWER: MC

DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 3/4/08

Providers are required to submit documentation for each component during the site visit. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.** Providers will be given an Unsatisfactory or Satisfactory for each component. Providers receiving an Unsatisfactory for any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report.

COMPONENT	DOCUMENTATION NEEDED	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE use only)	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
Tutor qualifications	**BOTH** of the following: -Tutor resumes/applications (all tutors) -Documentation of professional development opportunities in which tutors have participated (i.e. sign-sheets, agendas, presentations, certificates of completion, etc.) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Tutor evaluations (all tutors) -Recruiting policy for tutors (one copy) -Sample tutor contract (one copy)	Tutor resumes Description of professional development for Evansville Tutor sign-in sheets for PD Sample tutor evaluation form Sample tutor contract Assurances for area directors, site directors, tutors		X	• Provider application states that all tutors will at a minimum meet paraprofessional requirements. Most tutors are certified teachers with education experience. Most of those who are not certified teachers meet paraprofessional requirements and have experience in substitute teaching, early childhood care, or advanced degrees in curriculum and/or education. Some tutors have experience outside of education in areas such as youth development. • Professional development is provided monthly. In the sessions, administrative copies are covered, as well as working with students and tutoring session rules.
Recruiting materials	**TWO** of the following: -Advertising or recruitment fliers -Incentives policy -Program description for parents	• Program description for parents • Incentive policy • Flyers	X		• Program description for parents indicates that tutors are "highly qualified, and experienced teachers." However, a number of resumes submitted indicate that tutors not only are not "experienced teachers", but that they have little to no background in education. In addition, the term "highly qualified" has a specific connotation that is also specifically defined in No Child Left Behind. Based on resumes submitted, many tutors do not meet the

					NCLB definition of "highly qualified". ERC should avoid using this term unless all of its tutors meet the highly qualified terms of NCLB. A revised program description was submitted. • Incentive policy is based both on completion and on gains made by student. This is clearly delineated in the incentive policy and the program description for parents. • Incentive policy aligns with current state incentives policy. • ERC should avoid advertising its SES tutoring as "homework management skills". As noted in ERC's tutor assurances, ERC's program does not offer homework help. As such, ERC should avoid advertising its program as homework help. A revised program description was submitted.
Academic Program	**ONE** of the following: -Lesson plan(s) for the observed tutoring session(s) and for each subject in which provider tutors *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Specific connections to Indiana standards (cite exact IN standard to which lesson connects) -Description of connections to curriculum of EACH district the provider works with.	• Lesson plans • Some lesson plans indicate standards covered	X		• ERC's tutor assurances and its academic programming information submitted stresses that SES tutoring is not to be homework help and is to be primarily academic. However, the tutoring session description submitted in January indicates that tutors may spend up to 30 minutes on homework "when needed". 30 minutes of a 90-120 minute session is approximately 1/3 to ¼ of the time that a student is in the program, which is too much focus on homework help. Information was submitted to ensure that homework help will not be provided during billed SES time. • While one lesson plan clearly indicated standards to be covered, 5 lessons were covered in each box. For all 5 lessons, strategies such as "singing number songs, repetition of counting by numbers, using counting cubes, etc." were listed. It would be more helpful to tutors to separate out each session into

					one lesson plan that includes lesson objective and specific strategies to be used for that particular 1.5 hour lesson.
					• Lesson plans submitted for one tutor did not include standards to be covered. Some lesson plans included vague instructional strategies for 8 sessions; others included instructional strategies that are instructional materials (such as "dry erase boards", "markers", etc.). In addition, "facts sheets" and "worksheets" are not instructional strategies. Lesson plans must provide specific instructional strategies that are actual instructional strategies, not just materials or worksheets. As noted above, lesson plans should be designed for each lesson, not for 5 or 8 lessons.
					• Some lesson plans submitted indicated that students were working on standards not identified in their SES agreements.
					• For some lesson plans provided, it appeared that tutors were only working on either reading or math. While that is fine, the SES agreements for these students had BOTH reading and math checked. Subjects offered should match the subjects checked on the SES agreement.
					• Based on on-site monitoring, implementation of lesson plans was not consistent from site to site. Additionally, some tutors did not appear to have created lesson plans based on identified skill gaps or individual learning plans.
	ALL of the following: -Progress reports	• Timeline for sending progress reports • SES agreements for 2 IPS students, 2 Gary students, and 2 Evansville	X		• Progress reports are sent monthly. Feedback from three districts indicates that ERC is sending progress reports in a timely and satisfactory manner. • Progress reports include pre-test and post-test scores. However, some students' progress reports only had pre-test scores for one subject (not both,

| Progress Reporting | (see IDOE e-mail for details regarding the request for progress reports)
-Timeline for sending progress reports
-Documentation of reports sent | students
• Progress reports for 2 IPS students, 2 Gary students, and 2 Evansville students
• Contracts for MSD Lawrence, Anderson Com. Schools, IPS, EVSC, Gary Com. Schools | | | although the students' SES agreements indicated they were supposed to be receiving tutoring in both subjects).
• Progress reports include information about child's progress, attendance, and behavior, as well as a place for the parent's signature.
• As per the progress reporting checklist sent out by IDOE, progress reports should also include:
  • Goals from the SES agreement
  • A written statement that recommendations regarding how the progress report can be improved can be made by calling or e-mailing provider
• Progress reports did not always include relevant information. For example, the December/January progress reports for two students did not include any areas of concentration. Progress reports must be consistently completed across sites and must include lessons that students have covered.
• Progress reports submitted from Evansville were not consistent with progress reports submitted for IPS and Gary. Evansville progress reports did not always include information about student progress toward achieving objectives (some just had information about what the student worked on). Progress reports should be consistent across sites and districts and must include information about student progress, not just what the student is working on. Also, information should provide specific feedback to parents and schools on how a student is progressing in each area. Statements such as, "the student is working hard" are too vague and general and do not provide information about actual student progress in each area. In |

				addition, progress reports should include information about both student weaknesses AND strengths in areas of progress. Some progress reports only included specific information only about student weaknesses.
Assessment and Individual Program Design	**ALL** of the following: -Explanation of the process provider uses to develop Individual learning plans for each student - Pre-assessment scores and Individual learning plan for at least one student in each subject provider tutors (any identifying information for the student(s) must be blanked out) -Explanation and evidence regarding how provider's pre and post-test assessment correlates to Indiana academic standards.	• Description of process to develop individual learning plan • Evidence correlating the pre- and post-assessment to ISTEP+ and Indiana standards • Sample individual learning plan	X	• Description of individual learning plan indicates that plans are developed based on feedback from parents and the school, as well as the pre-test in reading and math. Although this is an acceptable description, observed lessons and discussions with tutors indicated that tutors do not always appear to be familiar with these individual learning plans, nor did they always appear to be implementing lessons that were based on individual learning plans (as noted, tutors appeared to implement lessons based on their individual knowledge of students, not based on learning plans developed from pre-assessments and other input). • As per documentation and responses submitted, students in Gary and IPS did not have official individual learning plans. All students must have individual learning plans. A revised learning plan was submitted. • Individual learning plan submitted includes information gathered from parent/guardian, information gathered from school, pre-test score, and Indiana standards being worked on. The individual learning plan should also include goals for student achievement.

On-site Monitoring Rubric
OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Educational Recovery Clinic　　　　　**DATE:** 02/07/08, 02/20/08
SITE: Daniel Webster Elementary School (Gary Com. Schools);　　**REVIEWER:** M.C., C.E., K.S.
Thomas Gregg School #15 (Indianapolis Public Schools)
TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 2 tutors + 2 tutors interviewed　　**TIME OF OBSERVATION:** 3:15P.M.; 4:06P.M
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 2

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a score of 1-4 points for each component. Providers receiving "1 or 2 points" on any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	1 Below Standard	2 Approaching Standard	3 Meeting Standard	4 Exceeding Standard	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		X			At the first site, some tutoring had already concluded due to an event being held that afternoon. One lesson was observed, and two additional tutors were interviewed. In the observed lesson, two students worked independently on workbook pages, while the tutor rotated between them to provide assistance. The tutor explained that in each session, 30 minutes was spent on individual work and 30 minutes was spent on skills enrichment. At the time students were observed, they were working on skills enrichment. The tutor interacted well with each student, and provided hints and tips to help them complete their work. The tutor explained that students were working on standards and concepts that they had covered in their classroom that day. Although much of the work observed was independent work, the tutor did provide help in connecting the work to concepts and vocabulary words. The tutor helped students come up with answers on their own with some coaching, but the tutor did not give students the answers. The tutor gave cues to help the students come to the correct answer. After a while, the tutor pulled word cards and started going over them with one student while the other student worked independently. Tutors in two other rooms (whose lessons had ended) were interviewed. They showed work completed and explained that lessons were created based on what students were working on in the classroom, or based on skill gaps that the tutors knew the students had from working with them in the school. One tutor explained that students begin working independently and then they finish in a small group. The other tutor explained that they alternate between small group work and independent work based on skill gaps identified

					from working with the children during the regular school day. At the second site, the tutor worked with three students playing a game about money. The tutor had paper money, cards, and coins. Students appeared to be grouped by ability. The tutor explained the concept of money (counting money, adding and subtracting with money) before beginning the game. The tutor explained that the object of the game was to see who had the most money. When students rolled a certain number, they landed on a space and had to count out the dollar amounts. Cards had things like, "go shopping"; "pay bills", etc.—when students picked those cards, they had to subtract (or add) the dollar amount to or from what they had. The tutor also incorporated additional math activities (adding/subtracting with money) into the game. The tutor explained to the students that they would play the game for another 15 minutes and then would go into a math lesson planned around adding and subtracting money, as well as grouping money and determining different money amounts. Tutors observed implemented lessons that appeared appropriate for the students they were tutoring. However, tutors appeared to "do their own thing" based on their own individual knowledge of students, not based on pre-assessment results or skill gaps that had been identified through the pre-assessment or based on utilization of the ERC curriculum. Tutors even indicated that they tend to create lessons for each day either based on what they taught in their classrooms that day, or what they personally know about students (not based on pre-assessment results or identified skill gaps from pre-assessments). To be appropriate across all sites, it is important that tutors are familiarized with pre-assessment results and are given information about particular skill gaps to be addressed through the ERC programming, including ERC curriculum. Applications, amendments, and corrective action plans for ERC note that tutoring programs will be designed based on pre-test results. Again, although observed tutors appeared very familiar with student skill gaps and learning levels, it is important (for maintaining consistency and fidelity to the approved ERC program) that tutors are utilizing pre-assessment results and are focusing lesson plans on the programs designed (based on pre-assessment results) for individual students.
Instruction is clear			**X**		In the first lesson observed, students appeared to understand what they were working on and what they were supposed to do. However, it did not appear that they were given information as to the larger objective of doing the workbook pages. Although workbook pages were highly individualized, it was not clear that students understood the larger concepts to which they were connected. The tutor did a good job of providing scaffolded instruction and helping students come to answers on their own. At the second site, students appeared to have a good understanding of what the objective of both the lesson and the game they were playing was. The tutor was able to connect the game to the larger concept of adding/subtracting/regrouping money. Students were clearly told what they were expected to do, and all students seemed to have a good understanding of the objective of the lesson.

Criterion					Comments
Time on task is appropriate				X	In both lessons observed, students were on task during the entire lesson. In the first lesson observed, the tutor adeptly rotated between the two students and ensured that they both had her attention when needed. Students had no trouble focusing on their work assigned. At the second site, students seemed to enjoy the money game and were very engaged in the adding and subtracting activities while they played the game. Sometimes one student would help another student who was struggling to add or subtract the amount given. Although the tutoring was located in a noisy cafeteria, the tutor did a good job ensuring that students were focused on the lesson at all times. Although students were on task, ERC's tutoring schedule indicates that tutoring at School 15 is supposed to begin at 3:45. Reviewers arrived at the school at 4:00, and tutoring had not yet begun (students were using the restroom). The tutor did not begin tutoring until 4:15. Additionally, reviewers arrived in Gary around 3:15 and were informed that many students who normally participate in SES had left early to attend a skating party. ERC should ensure that lessons adhere to the scheduling listed.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable		X			Each instructor observed or interviewed appeared to have a strong understanding of their students' abilities and needs. Instructors generally did a good job of employing a variety of instructional strategies to help students come up with answers on their own, including coaching, asking students to sound out words, or rephrasing questions to help students understand better. However, as described in the "Lesson Matches Original Description in Provider Application", it appeared that instructors were knowledgeable because they know the students (i.e., they work with them on a daily basis or are familiar with the students because of working in the school). Tutors did not seem familiar with assessment results or individual learning plans, nor did it seem that a specific academic program had been built for students based on assessment results. Instead, it seemed that tutors designed each student's lesson based on their individual knowledge of the student. While tutors observed did a very good job, not familiarizing tutors with assessment results or individual learning plans may result in inconsistent tutoring across sites. To be consistent with ERC's application and amendments and to ensure that all instructors are knowledgeable of ERC's pre-assessment and the fact that individual programming is supposed to be built on the pre-assessment, tutors must be familiarized with those pre-assessments and individual learning plans built on the pre-assessments.
Student/instructor ratio: 2:1; 3:1 Ratio matches that reported in original provider application			X		Ratios observed were below those noted in the amended application.

On-site Monitoring Visit Rubric
COMPLIANCE Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Educational Recovery Clinic   **DATE DOCUMENTATION RECEIVED: 3/4/08**
REVIEWER: MC

The following information is rated "Compliance" (C) or "Non-Compliance" (N-C). Selected documentation listed for each component must be submitted as part of the site visit monitoring. If documentation is not available on-site, the director or head of the provider's organization, the site director, or another authorized representative will be required to submit documentation to the IDOE within seven (7) calendar days of site visit completion. **Failure to submit evidence could result in removal from the approved provider list.**

If a provider is deemed to be in non-compliance with any component for which evidence has been requested, the provider may be contacted and may be required to develop and submit a corrective action plan for getting into compliance within 7 calendar days. If the corrective action plan is not submitted, if the corrective action plan is inappropriate or insufficient, or if the corrective action plan is not implemented, the provider may be removed from the state-approved list.

COMPONENT	REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION	DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED (IDOE USE ONLY)	C	N-C
Criminal background checks	**ALL** of the following: -Criminal background checks from an appropriate source for every tutor and any other employees working directly with children.	• Two background checks were misspelled • Some background checks were conducted by the employee, a violation of IDOE policies & procedures.		X
Health and safety laws and regulations	**ONE** of the following: -Student release policy(ies) *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Safety plans and/or records -Department of Health documentation of physical plant safety (if operating at a site other than a school) -Evacuation plans/policies (e.g., in case of fire, tornado, etc.) -Transportation policies (as applicable)	• Student information consent form • Emergency contact form • Transportation policy • Student release policy	X	
Financial viability	**ONE** of the following: -Documentation of liability insurance coverage *In addition to:* **ONE** of the following: -Audited financial statements -Tax return for the past two years	• Documentation of liability insurance • Tax return for two years	X	